REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

The applicant acknowledges, with thanks, receipt of the September 27, 2007, Office Action. This amendment is responsive to the September 27, 2007, Office Action. Presented herein are claim amendments and remarks distinguishing the claims from the cited prior art. Reconsideration of the application as amended is requested.

Claim Objections

Claim 1 was objected to because on line 3, of 5th paragraph the word "to" was repeated. Claim 1 has been amended to overcome this objection. Accordingly, withdrawal of this objection is requested.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 103

Claims 1-9, 14-19 and 34-37 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious in view of the combination of Bridgelall (US 2002/0085516; *hereinafter* Bridgelall) and Atwater et al. (US 2001/0010689; *hereinafter* Atwater). Withdrawal of this rejection is requested for reasons that will now be set forth.

Independent claims 1, 14 and 34 recite employing a first (e.g. a personal area network) wireless communication transceiver communicating with a first device for performing voice over Internet Protocol (VoIP) communication with a controller, such as a telephone controller. When the apparatus moves out of range of the first transceiver, a second transceiver (e.g. a Wireless Local Area Network WLAN transceiver such as an 802.11 transceiver) activates and performs the VoIP communication. When communication is lost with the first transceiver, the second transceiver sends a signal to the controller to route packets through the WLAN. When communication is re-established with the first transceiver, the first transceiver sends a signal notifying the controller to route signals through the first device.

By contrast, the transceiver currently communicating with the controller, not the transceiver taking over the call, initiates the transfer in Bridgelall. For example, when switching from the WWAN to the WLAN, Bridgelall states that the WWAN initiates the transfer to the

WLAN (¶ 69; *cf.* Abstract). Upon receiving the transfer request, the WWAN checks whether the gateway connected to the WLAN radio is registered (¶ 70). The WLAN radio then verifies the caller ID is from the WWAN radio (¶ 71). The network issues a signal confirming to the WWAN radio that it is transferring the call and dropping the WWAN connection (¶ 72). At this point the WLAN AP begins queuing VoIP voice samples while it waits for the WLAN connection to be established (*Id.*). The WWAN radio acknowledges the transfer and the WLAN radio establishes a connection, whereupon the queued voice samples are released (¶¶ 73-74). The embodiment recited in claims 1, 14 and 34 does not need to queue VoIP samples while waiting for the WLAN connection because the WLAN transceiver initiates the transfer and upon association with an access point (AP) the VoIP packets can be immediately routed to the handset via the AP.

Bridgelall performs a similar process when switching from the WLAN to the WWAN (*see* ¶¶ 77-83; *cf.* Abstract). The WLAN notifies the gateway to initiate a transfer to the WWAN radio. Similarly, the WWAN checks if the WWAN radio is registered on the network, notifies the WLAN radio the connection is being terminated and queues VoIP packets until the WWAN radio establishes communication with the network.

Claims 1, 14 and 34 recite that when transferring from the PAN to the WLAN, the WLAN transceiver notifies the controller, (unlike Bridgelall where the PAN would perform the notification) to send the packets via the WLAN. Because the WLAN transceiver is already in communication with the network, packets can be immediately sent to the handset. Similarly, when transferring from the WLAN to the PAN, the PAN notifies the controller (unlike Bridgelall where the WLAN would notify the controller) to redirect packets to PAN connection (e.g. the base unit). Because the PAN is already connected, no queuing of packets is necessary, and communication can be immediately switched to the PAN. Thus, Bridgelall does not teach or suggest each and every element of claims 1, 14 and 34.

The aforementioned deficiencies of Bridgelall are not remedied by any teaching of Atwater. Atwater is directed to a device that has a Bluetooth Transceiver and an 802.11 transceiver, but does not teach or suggest sending a signal to a controller on the network that instructs the controller how to send packets (such as VoIP packets) to the handset. Thus, neither Bridgelall nor Atwater, alone or in combination teach or suggest each and every element of

independen4t claims 1, 14 and 34. Therefore, independent claims 1, 14 and 34 are not obvious in view of Bridgelall and/or Atwater.

Claims 2-9 and 38 directly depend from claim 1 and therefore contain each and every element of claim 1. Thus, claims 2-9 and 38 are not obvious in view of the combination of Bridgelall and Atwater for the reasons already set forth for claim 1.

Claims 15-19 directly depend from claim 14 and therefore contain each and every element of claim 14. Thus, claims 15-19 are not obvious in view of the combination of Bridgelall and Atwater for the reasons already set forth for claim 14.

Claims 35-37 directly depend from claim 34 and therefore contain each and every element of claim 34. Thus, claims 35-37 are not obvious in view of the combination of Bridgelall and Atwater for the reasons already set forth for claim 34.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, withdrawal of the rejections to this application is requested and a Notice of Allowance is earnestly solicited. If there are any fees necessitated by the foregoing communication, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge such fees to our Deposit Account No. 50-0902, referencing our Docket No. 72255/30267.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 12-27-2007

Larry B. Donovan
Registration No. 47,230
TUCKER ELLIS & WEST LLP
1150 Huntington Bldg.
925 Euclid Ave.
Cleveland, Ohio 44115-1414
Customer No.: 23380
Tel.: (216) 696-3864
Fax: (216) 592-5009